

Subject: Cross Long Island Sound Gas Line
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Mon, 17 Nov 2003 11:20:25 -0500
From: "Richard N. Platt, Jr." <r.platt@snet.net>
Reply-To: richard.platt.sm.55@aya.yale.edu
Organization: home
To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Dear NOAA:

The Secretary of Commerce should not reverse the decision of the Connecticut DEP concerning the Cross Long Island Sound Gas Line. There is no justification for federal intervention, as a feasible and reasonable alternative exists.

Respectfully,

Richard N. Platt, Jr.

Richard N. Platt, Jr.

132 Platt Lane

Milford, CT 06460-2054

(203) 878-6094

r.platt@snet.net

richard.platt.sm.55@aya.yale.edu (permanent alias)

Subject: Cross Sound Gas Line
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Mon, 17 Nov 2003 12:27:10 -0500
From: Marion Morra <morram@earthlink.net>
To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Dear General Counsel: I wish to protest federal intervention in the issue of the Cross Sound Gas Line -- putting this line through the Thimble Island off Stony Creek. The Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection has spoken on this subject and there is no justification to reverse the decision of our own State's DEP. A feasible and reasonable alternative exists and there is no need for federal intervention. Marion E. Morra, 1 Platt Street, Milford, CT. 06460

Subject: Pipeline

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Mon, 17 Nov 2003 15:04:48 -0500

From: "Jerry Shaff" <jerry@polyclutch.com>

To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

CC: <KKennedyMD@aol.com>

I am writing in regard to the Islander East proposed pipeline. Islander East has made statements that are not true and ignore the facts.

They say that their project will "reduce our dependency on foreign oil", "ensure that the energy delivered to the region is safe and environmentally friendly", and "make for a brighter future in Connecticut". They fail to mention that **all of the gas** can be delivered to Long Island by using existing pipelines that have already done their environmental damage. It is not necessary to repeat this damage just so they can have a monopoly on the gas that will eventually go to the New York market. And of course they ignore the fact that **none** of the gas will go to Connecticut.

Their safety claims are particularly dishonest. If they were concerned with safety, they would not be proposing to run the line directly under or next to a railroad with extremely heavy loads from hauling rocks to the coast. When these trains pass, they shake a building 100 yards away. What would their effect be on the high pressure pipe almost directly under the track? Although this may be the cheapest route, it is criminal to do this. It is dangerous enough so that they organized their company so that Duke Power will not be liable for any disaster that they cause.

If they were really concerned with safety, they could do two things that would help, but would be more costly. First, they could certify their welds to the same standards that are used on nuclear submarines. Because a bad weld could be disastrous in a sub, they Xray each pass of a weld, grind away any voids, and reweld. A bad weld in the high pressure pipeline is equally dangerous and can cause loss of life. Because they want to put the pipeline under the railroad in a populated area, they should be held to tighter standards than if they were crossing open farmland.

Second, they can put a thinner pipe "jacket" around the main pipe and sense any pressure increase in the gap. They could then sense any tiny leak, and where it is, before it becomes an explosion. This would be good procedure anywhere in a pipeline, but especially under a railroad.

I realize that any time a company wants to run a pipeline, the people in its path will object. **This is different however, because of the reckless path under the railroad, and the fact that an alternate pipeline is already in place**

I am in favor of reducing our dependency on foreign oil, and bringing clean gas to New York. And I have nothing against a company making a profit. But with an alternate route available, the **only** reason for the Islander East project is to give this monopoly to Islander East. It will definitely harm the environment, it is the most dangerous path, and It will not help our country in any way,

Gerald Shaff
17 Whiting Farm Road
Branford, Ct 06405

Subject: Islander East Coastal Consistency Determination
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Mon, 17 Nov 2003 16:30:00 EST
From: Ginayogacreek@aol.com
To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Dear Sir or Ms.,

I submit to you my strong concerns regarding the possible pipeline development which Islander East has proposed. The environmental harm certainly will outway any benefits-especially when one considers the economics of commercial shellfish beds. The beauty of the Long Island Sound as a natural resource and recreational area is valued by many in Ct.

Please uphold the decision by the Ct. DEP to deny Islander East Pipeline a "coastal consistency determination" under the Coastal Zone Management Act.


Sincerely,
Virginia Macdonald MA, L.P.C.

Subject: pipeline through LIS
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Mon, 17 Nov 2003 16:53:10 -0500
From: Johan Varekamp <jvarekamp@wesleyan.edu>
To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

To whom it may concern.

I was unable to attend the public hearing in New Haven, CT on the IslanderEast project, so I like to file my deposition this way. Please find attached a letter with comments on the environmental impact statement of the Islander east project.

Best wishes, Joop Varekamp

 branfordNOAA.doc	Name: branfordNOAA.doc Type: WINWORD File (application/msword) Encoding: base64 Download Status: Not downloaded with message
--	---

Johan (Joop) C. Varekamp
George I. Seney Professor of Geology
Earth & Environmental Sciences
tel: 860 685 2248
e-mail: jvarekamp@wesleyan.edu
<http://www.wesleyan.edu/ees/varekamp.html>

(on leave for fall 2003, mainly at Wesleyan University)

Mailing Address:
Dr. Joop Varekamp
Earth & Environmental Sciences
265 Church Street, Wesleyan University
Middletown CT 06459-0139
USA

Office of the General Counsel for Ocean Services
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
U.S. Department of Commerce
1305 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910

November 19, 2003

To whom it may concern.

The Islander East project proposal to put a natural gas transport pipeline from Connecticut to Long Island has several negative environmental impacts that have been recognized by various offices, including CTDEP. My expertise is in the contaminant burdens of Long Island Sound (LIS) sediment, especially mercury (Hg), and in coastal salt marsh studies. I have read the FEIS from the FERC for this project and would like to make the following remarks:

The FEIS refers to a sediment contaminant study by Mecray and Buchholtz ten Brink (2000) that was published in a special issue of the Journal of Coastal Research for which I was one of the editors. The analytical data in this paper were determined on surface sediments (upper 2 cm) only. Unpublished data by these authors and data collected by me show that contaminant levels in many spots are higher at depths ranging from 5-30 cm (the period of sediment deposition from 1950-1975). The trench excavation will dig up also these more strongly contaminated sediments, so the use of only surface sediment contaminant data as a reference may be questionable. On the other hand, much deeper sediment layers, deposited prior to the industrial revolution, will have lower contaminant burdens.

With special reference to Mercury, the more dangerous form of Hg (methyl-Hg) is formed in the sediment column by bacteria, and reworking the sediments will release this bio-available form of Hg. Use of surface sediment bulk Hg data as a benchmark is therefore not adequate to estimate environmental impact of trace metal dispersal.

The contaminants in sediment are associated with the fine-grained material fraction. The clay-sized fraction (< 4 micrometer) usually consists of clays, organic material and Fe-Mn oxides, which serve as hosts for the contaminants. During excavation and during dredge disposal, it is this fine-grained material that will be suspended and re-deposited on the bottom surface of LIS. This fine-grained material has much higher contaminant concentrations than the bulk sediment, and so again, using bulk sediment

contaminant data as a reference when the dispersal is largely confined to the very fine fraction may create an overoptimistic scenario regarding contaminant redistribution.

p. 2

A risk that is not discussed in detail in the FEIS is the potential occurrence of Harmful Algal Blooms (HAB) during sediment disturbances. The occurrence of HABs has been documented in eutrophied estuaries along the east coast after heavy storms suspended sediments in the water column. The sediments may contain resting spores (cysts) of various unicellular algae (dinoflagellates); upon release into the water column the motile phases of the algae emerge from the cysts and may create large algal blooms. Many of these algae are toxic to human beings; when the algae are taken up by shell fish, these are no longer fit for human consumption. Risks of HAB-occurrence are minimized if work is done during the winter months (December-February).

We have worked extensively in the marshes of the Short Beach section of Branford and have found preliminary evidence that this region may carry more seismic risk than neighboring regions. One of the major structural lineaments in Connecticut, the **eastern border fault**, runs through the Farm River marshes. A detailed analysis of the salt marsh sediment (unpublished MA thesis of William Thompson, Wesleyan University, 1999) suggests that repeated off-sets occurred along the trace of the buried eastern border fault. The current thinking is that this ancient fault system (~200 million years) was reactivated during the ice unloading after the last glacial period (< 15,000 years). Our data suggest that sudden off-sets of several tens of cm (with associated earthquakes) occurred with recurrence intervals of 500-1000 years. This study has not yet been published in the reviewed, open literature; one published paper (van de Plassche et al., 2002) already has tried to void this hypothesis. That paper is based on very limited data, however, and may suggest that the recurrence interval is rather longer (~1000 years) than shorter (~500 years). Nonetheless, despite this unfolding debate, a more detailed study of the marshes seems warranted to shed further light on potential seismic hazards around Branford.

The recent document by CTDEP Commissioner Arthur Rocque Jr. summarizes the various environmental impacts that would be caused by the proposed Islander East project. The arguments listed above only add to these concerns. Taking all these considerations together, it would be commendable to seriously consider the ELI alternative as outlined in the FEIS. I would be happy to expand on these arguments and provide the primary data on which some of these arguments are based, both in published papers and in theses at Wesleyan University.

Sincerely,

Johan C. Varekamp
George I. Seney Professor Geology

Subject: A speech I wrote -- Superior Alternatives to a Second Long-Island Pipeline
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Mon, 17 Nov 2003 22:18:06 -0500
From: "Andrew Gullans" <andrewgullans@netzero.net>
To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

----- Original Message -----

From: Andrew Gullans

To: merr22@aol.com

Cc: rebeccawilkin@outbound.capwiz.com

Sent: Monday, November 10, 2003 3:10 PM

Subject: A speech I wrote -- Superior Alternatives to a Second Long-Island Pipeline

Not too long ago, a nuclear power plant was built to bolster New York City's burgeoning power consumption. The citizens of Long Island protested, saying "Not in my backyard." Initiatives were then put forward to construct a number of conventional power plants in the same area for the same purpose. The people, who's extravagant power consumption necessitated these plans, again cried "Not in my backyard." Now, you want to build a second pipeline from Connecticut all the way across Long Island Sound, while the first (which wreaked irreversible environmental damage to the sea floor) is only being utilized at 30% capacity. This plan fills the pockets of an elite few corporate pigs, provides no real salient benefit to most Long Islanders, and does grievous harm to us in Connecticut and our beloved, fragile environs. Well, to this I say "Not in my backyard!"

Connecticut will not be a vassal state to corporate greed. We will not allow our delicate ecosystems to be irrevocably scourged for an unneeded pipeline to conduct a nonrenewable fuel to obsolete generators on the other side of the water, especially when we already have one that is not being used to its full potential. That right there indicates that someone is trying to make money off a bum deal. It is not within our technology's ability to create coastal wetlands and shellfish beds; these are irreplaceable natural treasures of incalculable value.

It is, however, within our present technological ability to build and implement alternative means of power generation. There is enough unused acreage atop the skyscrapers of Manhattan to install enough windmills to light all five boroughs. Simple dual-phase salt-water evaporation/rehydration tanks, wherein water is added to sodium with explosive steam-generating effect and later separated passively by evaporation under sunlight, already produce remarkable wattage in Sweden. Tidal hydroelectric generators can also be successfully employed in New York Harbor with negligible impact. Every day, millions of tons of exploitable biological waste are generated by the Empire City and Long Island, all of which can be used to produce methane and other burnable gasses as well as fusible fuel for power production. I don't even need to mention solar power.

We are living at the emergence of the age of safe, clean hydrogen power, a new industry which promises millions of jobs, billions in profits and the future wellbeing of our species. Government initiatives towards the wholesale conversion of our petrochemical-based powergrid to hydrogen power offer money and tax-cuts to those visionary companies who dare to implement the inevitable dream of hydrogen power. Natural gas, like all petrochemicals, is a resource both obsolete and finite.

If more power is needed and corporate money is ready to fund the expansion of the powergrid, why are not hydrogen fuel generators being built? The profits and benefits of this proven technology are far beyond the wildest expectations of the unsound pipeline proposal we intend to shoot down here today. Although the move to more advanced power-production requires significant initial investments, like any project, I guarantee the safety, efficiency, profitability and inevitability of hydrogen fuel.

People, the future is upon us. The prosperity, the very survival of America, our species and our planet is at stake little by little every time some shyster tries to pull a fast one like the construction of this pipeline. The short-sightedness many humans exhibit when filling their pockets is an appalling blemish on the rest of our species, which ultimately threatens to render our irreplaceable planet uninhabitable. So I say again: "Not in my backyard; not in anyone's backyard." It is time to evolve, to use newer, safer, smarter, better technology.